

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

EDWARD PHILLIP MCKENNA,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
CISNEROS, *et al.*,  
Defendants.

No. 1:24-cv-00607-KES-BAM (PC)  
ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND  
RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING  
PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR COURT  
ORDER  
(Docs. 80, 82)

Plaintiff Edward Phillip McKenna is a state prisoner proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This matter was referred to a United States magistrate judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.

On April 28, 2025, plaintiff filed a motion for court order, (Doc. 80), which was construed as a request for preliminary injunctive relief. (Doc. 82.) On May 2, 2025, the assigned magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations to deny plaintiff's motion for preliminary injunction. (*Id.*) The findings and recommendations were served on plaintiff and contained notice that any objections thereto were to be filed within fourteen (14) days after service. (*Id.* at 4.) No objections have been filed, and the deadline to do so has expired.

///

///

///

1        In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b)(1), this Court has conducted a de  
2 novo review of the case. Having carefully reviewed the file, the Court concludes that the findings  
3 and recommendations are supported by the record and by proper analysis.

4        Accordingly:

- 5        1.        The findings and recommendations issued on May 2, 2025, (Doc. 82), are adopted  
6              in full;
- 7        2.        Plaintiff's motion for court order, (Doc. 80), is denied; and
- 8        3.        The matter is referred back to the assigned magistrate judge.

9  
10      IT IS SO ORDERED.

11      Dated: July 22, 2025

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28